

duplicates because they do not cover substantially the same subject matter. Thus, while claim 14 is admittedly limited to a cell, claim 13 recites a "device" which includes cells and other devices. Note that page 5, lines 19-24 of the specification, relied on in the Office Action, describes a cell in line 21 as an example of a "device", which should be given its generally accepted meaning as any "piece of equipment or a mechanism designed to serve a special purpose or perform a special function"; see Merriam Websters' Collegiate Dictionary, 10th Edition, page 317. Furthermore, this position is clearly supported in applicants' specification on page 19, lines 10-17, where examples of contemplated electric devices include "cells, capacitors and the like". In view of the foregoing, there is no apparent foundation for this objection which should therefore be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 4, 6-10 and 12-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Takeda et al. (JP 2000-173343, abstract). It is believed that this rejection has been obviously overcome by the foregoing amendment, as a result of which claim 1 is canceled, claim 2 is allowable and all the other claims depend from claim 2 either directly or through an intervening claim.

This application is now thought to be in condition for allowance and such action at an early date is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By C. Bruce Hamburg
C. Bruce Hamburg
Reg. No. 22,389
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340

by Jacqueline M. Steady
BY JACQUELINE M. STEADY
REG. NO. 44,354

C